



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/585,441	06/02/2000	Jong Dae Park	8733.20113	6851

7590 12/21/2001
Long Aldridge & Norman LLP
701 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20004

EXAMINER

PRASAD, CHANDRIKA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/585,441

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 18-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 18-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri ority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Reopening of Prosecution After Appeal

1. In view of the Appeal brief filed on 11/20/01, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds for rejections are set forth below. Any inconvenience resulting from a delay in finding the new references is deeply regretted.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

- 2. The finality of the office action mailed 2/22/01 is withdrawn.
- 3. Applicant's arguments with respect to objections to the drawings and 112 – 2nd paragraph rejections have overcome these objections and rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- 5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Teagno et al.

Art Unit: 2839

Teagno (Figures 1-4) shows a device for connecting an electrode (pin) 14 to a wire 7 having an exterior sheath and a conductive core. The device has a first clamping part 6 for pressing and securing the wire, a second clamping part 5 for pressing and securing the conductive core of the wire and a third clamping part with snap-fit portions 11 for pressing and securing the electrode wherein the third clamping part is perpendicular to the first and second clamping parts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 23-25 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, Jr. in view of Teagno et al.

Schmitt (Figures 3-7) shows a device 92 for connecting an electrode 86 from a lamp to a wire 30 having a conductive core. The device has an elongated conductive flexible body with a first body part 108 for crimping to the wire. The device has another body part integral with the first body part at an angle (180 degrees) to receive and clamp the electrode. The second body part has a hole and snap-fit arms (portions) 106 perpendicular to the arms of the first body part 108.

But Schmitt does not show the body part 108 having two pairs of arms for crimping to the wire and the core of the wire; and the two body parts at right angles to each other. The use of two pairs of arms to crimp a wire and its core, and two body parts being at right angles to each other are well known in the art of electrical connectors. Teagno (Figure 1) shows a

Art Unit: 2839

terminal 1 with two pairs of bendable arms 5 and 6 for crimping to the core of the wire 7 and the wire 7, respectively. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide the two pair of arms to the crimping portion 108 for crimping to the wire 30 and its core because this would secure the wire as well as its core to the device 92 as shown by Teagno and well known in the art of electrical connectors.

Teagno further shows the terminal 1 having two body parts at right angles to each other. The instant invention does not provide any reasons or problems to be solved by providing the two crimping portions being at right angles. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the two body parts of the Schmitt's device at right angles because this would provide a means to connect an electrode to a wire at right angle to the electrode. Furthermore, making the two body parts at right angles would require a simple rearrangement of parts, which would involve only routine skill in the art. In re Japiske, 86 USPQ 70.

8. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, Jr. and Teagno et al. in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA).

Schmitt and Teagno shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 7 above except crimping of the lamp, which contains the electrode 86. Schmitt shows the crimping of the electrode 86 instead of the lamp. If the hole in the crimping portion 102 is made large enough, it could be used to crimp the lamp. AAPA (Figures 1-2 of the instant invention) shows the crimping of the lamp 2 having the electrode 8. The instant invention does not provide any reasons or specific problem to be solved by crimping the lamp instead of the electrode. Crimping the lamp instead of the electrode is considered analogous as shown by AAPA because both serve the same purpose, i.e., to secure the electrode.

Art Unit: 2839

9. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, Jr., Teagno et al. and AAPA as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Crimmins et al.

Schmitt, Teagno and AAPA show all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 8 above except soldering and a means to prevent flow of solder up the wire. The use of soldering and a means to prevent flow of solder to certain areas (commonly known as anti-wicking) is well known in the art of electrical connectors. Crimmins (Figure 8) shows the use of solder and a tight fitting seal provided by member 90 to prevent flow of solder up the terminal and into the contact cavity 54. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to solder the Schmitt wire 30 to the device near the crimping portion because it would provide a permanent connection as shown by Crimmins, and furthermore clinch the crimping arms hard to provide a seal to prevent flow of solder up the wire because this would prevent contamination of the wire as taught by Crimmins.

10. Claims 26, 27, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, Jr. and Teagno et al. as applied to claims 23 and 28 above, and further in view of Crimmins et al.

Schmitt and Teagno show all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 7 above except soldering and a means to prevent flow of solder up the wire. The use of soldering and a means to prevent flow of solder to certain areas (commonly known as anti-wicking) is well known in the art of electrical connectors. Crimmins (Figure 8) shows the use of solder and a tight fitting seal provided by member 90 to prevent flow of solder up the terminal and into the contact cavity 54. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use solder the Schmitt wire 30 to the device near the crimping portion because it would provide a permanent connection as shown by Crimmins, and furthermore clinch the crimping arms hard to provide a seal to prevent flow of solder up the wire because this would prevent contamination of the wire as taught by Crimmins.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pritulsky and Newman et al. also show a device with two integral portions at right angles to each other and two pairs of arms to crimp a wire and its core.

Response to Argument

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5 and 18-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Teagno et al., Pritulsky and Newman et al. all show a device with two body parts at right angles to each other and two pairs of arms to crimp a wire and its core.

Contact Information

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad at (703) 308-0977. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached at (703) 308-3119. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308/7722. Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 308-1782.



Chandrika Prasad

December 11, 2001



BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800